

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED

08 AUG 18 AM 11:43

Clerk's Office File Stamp
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TO: ☒ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Sabraw
FROM: J. Paris, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 7/3/08 DEPUTY
CASE NO.: 07cv2388 DOCUMENT FILED BY: Mr. Fox
CASE TITLE: Fox v. USA, et al.
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion denying

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/>	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/>	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<u>OTHER: Case Closed</u>

Date forwarded: 7/3/08

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.
- Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☒ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Judge Sabraw

Dated: 8/18/08
cc: All Parties

By: mm

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PLAINITFF

MICHAEL FOX

VERSES

DEFENDANTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA et.al.

CASE# 07CV 2388 DMS (POR)

RECONSIDERATION MOTION ON
COURTS MOTION TO DENY PLAINITFF
DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS AGANIST

FEDERAL DEFENDANTS

MOTION AUG 15 2008---1:30PM
JUDGE DANA M SABRAW COURT ROOM 10

- 1) PLAINITFF FILED A PETITION AND COMPLAINT WITH EXHIBITS 1 THRU 20 ON DEC 20 2007 IN DISTRICT COURT CLERKS OFFICE.
- 2) PLAINTIFF FILED PETITION AND COMPLAINT AGAINST FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS, US DEPT OF JUSTICE. AND THE US ATTORNEYS OFFICE.
- 3) PLAINTIFF PETITIONING FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATION IN THE EXCESS OF 20 YEARS INCLUDING THE MOST RECENT STAGED CAR WRECK ON FEB 4 2008 IN GALVESTON TEXAS.
- 4) PLAINITFF SEEKING ADDTIONAL ORDERS OF THE COURT THROUGH THE PETITION IN THE AMOUNT OF 25 PETITION REQUESTS
- 5) PLAINTIFF FILING 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT IN JAN 30TH 2008
- 6) DEFENDANTS FILE FOR MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE ON FEB 26 2008
- 7) COURT REJECTS DEFENDANTS MOTION STATING IT IS MUTE ON MARCH 7TH 2008
- 8) PLAINITFF FILING FOR DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS ON TWO SEPERATE OCCASIONS--ONE BEING DENIED 2ND APPLICATION FILED ON APRIL 1 2008.. COURT APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION WITH-OUT ORAL ARGUMENTS..
- 9) DEFENDANTS FILING FOR MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINITFFS CASE ON APRIL 7TH 2008, AFTER PLAINITFF FILING FOR DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS AND FURTHER DEFENDANTS BEING DENIED THERE MOTION SEEKING ADDTIONAL TIME TO FILE THERE ANSWER.